REMARKS

The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated November 16, 2005. Claims 1, 6, 8, 10, 13, 16, 17, 20, 24 and 25 have been amended. Claims 5, 15 and 23 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-22 and 24-31 remain pending in this case. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the original claims in this application and in other applications.

Claims 1-9 and 11-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,896,321) in view of Newbold et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,576,955). Applicants respectfully submit that the amended claims overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended claim 1 recites a method for correcting text input into a text document, comprising the steps of, *inter alia*, receiving a text selection input into the text document from at least one source comprising one of the following: stochastic and non-stochastic, the text selection comprising two or more text components, receiving a selection of an erroneous text component from the two or more text components of the text selection, receiving a command to display a list of alternatives to the erroneous text component, in response to receiving the command to display the list of alternatives to the erroneous text component, submitting the erroneous text component to a correction scope model to determine if a scope of correction should be adjusted if the correction scope model determines the scope of correction should be adjusted, then receiving from the correction scope model a text unit that includes the erroneous text component and at least one text component from the text selection adjacent the erroneous text component.

Amended claim 13 recites a method for correcting text input into a text document, comprising the steps of, *inter alia*, receiving a text selection input into the text document comprising two or more text components from at least one source comprising one of the following: stochastic and non-stochastic, receiving a selection of an erroneous text component from the two or more text components of the text selection, receiving a command to display a list of alternatives to the erroneous text component, in response to

receiving the command to display the list of alternatives to the erroneous text component, submitting the erroneous text component to a correction scope model to determine if a scope of correction should be adjusted, if the correction scope model determines the scope of correction should be adjusted, then receiving from the correction scope model a text unit that includes the erroneous text component and at least one text component from the text selection adjacent the erroneous text component.

Amended 20 recites method for correcting text input into a text document, comprising the steps of, *inter alia*, receiving a text selection input into said text document comprising two or more text components from at least one source comprising one of the following: stochastic and non-stochastic, receiving a selection of an erroneous text component from the two or more text components of the text selection, receiving a command to display a list of alternatives to the erroneous text component, in response to receiving the command to display the list of alternatives to the erroneous text component, submitting the erroneous text component to a correction scope model to determine if a scope of correction should be adjusted, if the correction scope model determines the scope of correction should be adjusted, then receiving from the correction scope model a text unit that includes the erroneous text component and at least one text component from the text selection adjacent the erroneous text component.

Miller discloses a text completion system that automatically displays a prioritized list of completion suggestions for a partial data entry in response to a pause in receipt of the data entry. See Miller column 4, lines 29-50. Miller also discloses that if a complete data entry does not correspond to an entry in the dictionary, the word prediction system adds the complete data entry to the dictionary and deletes another data entry from the dictionary. The word prediction system also adds the complete data entry to a list of recently received words. See Miller column 7, lines 7-19.

Newbold discloses a method and apparatus for handling errors in a data processing environment. Newbold also discloses an error unit which can detect errors such as "spelling, usage, custom usage, punctuation, broken words, doubled words, capitalization, and spacing. The present invention has the capability to address any type

of error. The present invention identifies errors as mechanical or non-mechanical errors. A mechanical error is an error that is context-sensitive, and is best understood by viewing the error in the text in which it occurred. Examples of mechanical errors are punctuation, broken words, doubled words, capitalization, and spacing. Non-mechanical errors can usually be communicated without viewing the error in its context. Examples of non-mechanical errors are spelling and usage." See Newbold column 4, lines 15-29. Newbold also discloses an error list. "Once the text has been scanned for errors, the present invention builds a list of the detected errors at 150 in FIG. 2. The Error List is used to communicate errors (either mechanical or non-mechanical errors) to the user in a more intuitive manner than prior art systems. The Error List provides the ability to communicate the errors outside of the context of the original text. This results in a greater number of errors being displayed on the screen, and provides the ability to scan the errors to determine the manner in which to approach the correction of the errors." See Newbold column 4, lines 33-43.

The combination of Miller and Newbold fails to teach or suggest all the recitations of claims 1, 13 and 20. Specifically, the combination fails to teach or suggest receiving a text selection input into the text document from at least one source comprising one of the following: stochastic and non-stochastic, the text selection comprising two or more text components, as recited in claim 1. Miller does not disclose such a recitation. Newbold also fails to recite such a recitation. To the contrary, Newbold merely identifies mechanical errors using the context of the text and does not employ a stochastic input and therefore cannot receive a text selection input from a stochastic input. See Newbold column 4, lines 23-25.

Claims 13 and 20 recite similar recitations as those mentioned above with respect to claim 1. As mentioned previously, neither Miller nor Newbold teaches or suggests such a recitation.

Thus, Miller and Newbold whether considered alone or in combination fail to teach or suggest all the recitations of claims 1, 13 and 20. Accordingly, claims 1, 13 and 20 are allowable over Miller and Newbold, or a combination thereof. Claims 2-4, 6-12,

28 and 31 depend from claim 1, claims 14, 16-19 and 29 depend from claim 13 and claims 21, 22, 24-27 and 30 depend from claim 20, and are allowable along with claims 1, 13 and 20, for the reasons mentioned above and on their own merit.

In addition, neither Miller nor Newbold provides motivation for their combination. To the contrary, Miller provides auto text completion within the document. Newbold explicitly states, "The Error List provides the ability to communicate the errors outside of the context of the original text. This results in a greater number of errors being displayed on the screen, and provides the ability to scan the errors to determine the manner in which to approach the correction of the errors." See Newbold column 4, lines 37-43. As one reference suggests editing within the document, while to other claims the benefit of error correction outside the document, Applicants submit that the combination of Miller and Newbold is improper.

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller in view of Newbold further in view of Oberteuffer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,438,523). Applicants respectfully submit that the amended claims overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

As mentioned above, the combination of Miller and Newbold fails to teach or suggest all the recitations of claim 1. Claim 10 depends from claim 1 and is allowable over the combination of Miller and Newbold.

Oberteuffer discloses a computer system 100 which can receive several types of devices for providing gesture interaction with mode processing logic 104. FIG. 9 is a block diagram of computer system 100 for processing gesture, handwritten, and hand-drawn input and speech input comprising several of the elements. See Oberteuffer column 7, lines 44-48. Oberteuffer fails to teach or suggest receiving a text selection input into the text document from at least one source comprising one of the following: stochastic and non-stochastic, the text selection comprising two or more text components, as recited in claim 1.

Thus, Miller Newbold, and Oberteuffer whether considered alone or in combination fail to teach or suggest all the recitations of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is

allowable over Miller Newbold, and Oberteuffer, or a combination thereof. Claim 10 depends from claim 1 and is allowable along with claim 1, for the reasons mentioned above and on its own merit.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned please contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at 404.954.5040.

Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD, LLC

Date: February 17, 2006

Devon K. Grant
Reg. No. 57,036

MERCHANT & GOULD, LLC
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
(404) 954.5042